

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/978,441	WILLIAMS, COLE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeff H. Aftergut	1733	

All Participants:(1) Jeff H. Aftergut.(2) James Brunton.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 14 June 2004**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

11, 15

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) _____

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed how in claim 11 it appears intrinsic that the bladder was longer than the inner fabric layer otherwise the bladder would not have been capable of being in sealable contact with the wearer's extremity. Additionally, noted that for the coated bladder to be in sealable contact (based upon the specification) it would appear that the bladder must have a glazed, smooth surface in the contact area with the wearer's extremity. Noted that in claim 15 if the bladder was placed over the first fabric member that it must be overlying the first fabric member and the upper portion of the bladder would extend beyond the same. Applicant's representative agreed that this was the correct relationship and agreed to the proposed examiner's amendment to correct the language..